

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-34 were pending at the time of examination. Claims 1, 13, 14 and 28 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled. The applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the foregoing amendments and these remarks.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter, since the “computer program product” and “computer readable program code” is not operating on a tangible medium. The applicants have amended the preamble of claim 13 to recite a computer program product that is stored on a machine-readable medium. The applicants submit that claim 13 as amended is directed to statutory subject matter, and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-5, 7-19 and 21-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,526,044 to Cookmeyer, II et al. (hereinafter Cookmeyer). The applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for the following reasons.

Generally, the preamble of claim 1 has been amended to more clearly specify that the method is directed to routing of application-level messages from one or more sending services to one or more recipient services across a message interchange network, in order to more precisely define the subject matter of the invention. In the message routing method of claim 1, a first service with a first context is invoked, followed by an invocation of a second service with a second context that is defined at least in part by the first service.

Cookmeyer, on the other hand, is directed to a knowledge base system which uses a “protocol analyzer” to acquire real time statistical data on network signal traffic in a monitoring session. The session performance history is then reported as a real time composite of measured statistics and analysis-derived statistics, together with a real time report of discarded frames (Cookmeyer, Abstract). All the statistical data that is gathered in Cookmeyer is related to low-level, frame processing, which is clearly different from the high application-level message routing that is specified in claim 1.

Furthermore, the first step of claim 1 requires that a first service is invoked “during a logical routing of an application-level message.” As can be seen in the specification in paragraph [1087] as well as in several other places throughout the specification, this logical routing enables a service to modify the routing of the message or modify the context of the

message for delivery to the next service. It should be noted that a service can be logically included in a message routing without being included as part of the physical routing of the message. That is, the physical routing of an application-level message is a subset of the logical routing of the application-level message. It is respectfully submitted that no logical routing of this type occurs in Cookmeyer.

Claim 1 also specifies that each service invocation has a context. Several examples of contexts are given in the specification in paragraph [1097]. Some of the listed examples include an identity of the invoker service, arguments to the invoked service, a session identifier for a message, a topic for a message, a billing responsibility for the invocation, or any other information that can be used by the invoked service. In particular, the second step of claim 1 specifies that the context for invocation of the second service "is defined at least in part by said first service." That is, in accordance with the invention, an invoking service has the ability to set the context for invocation of other services. This ability is notably absent in Cookmeyer. Even if one were to accept the Examiner's interpretation of context as manually answering a series of questions, this "context" would always be based entirely on manual user input and not "at least in part by said first service." For at least these reasons it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-12 all depend from claim 1, and are therefore neither anticipated nor rendered obvious for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, and the rejections of claims 2-12 should be withdrawn.

Claim 13 is a *Beauregard* claim corresponding to claim 1, and is neither anticipated nor obvious for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, and the rejection of claim 13 should be withdrawn.

Claim 14 is a system claim with limitations similar to the limitations of claim 1, and was rejected with the same rationale as claim 1. Claim 14 is therefore neither anticipated nor obvious for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, and the rejection of claim 14 should be withdrawn. In addition claim 14 further specifies the further limitation of the message routing network restoring a message context to a context state of an invoking service of said service invocation, which is not disclosed in Cookmeyer.

Claims 15-27 all depend from claim 14, and are therefore neither anticipated nor obvious for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 14, and the rejections of claims 15-27 should be withdrawn.

Claim 28 is a method claim directed to a message routing method. Steps (b) and (c) are similar to the limitations of claim 1, and were rejected for the same reasons as claim 1. Step (a)

has been modified to more clearly specify an "application-level message." Claim 28 is therefore neither anticipated nor obvious for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, and the rejection of claim 14 should be withdrawn.

Claims 29-34 all depend from claim 28, and are therefore neither anticipated nor obvious for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 28, and the rejections of claims 29-34 should be withdrawn.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 6, 20 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cookmeyer in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/001385 to Eggelston et al. (hereinafter Eggelston). The applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for the following reasons.

Eggelston is used by the Examiner to show logging of billing information. Claims 6, 20 and 34 depend from claim 1, 14 and 28, which were found above to be neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Cookmeyer alone. Assuming it were possible to add the billing logging function of Eggelston to Cookmeyer, it would still not render any of claims 6, 20 and 34 any more obvious than claims 1, 14, and 28 alone, respectively, as Eggelston does not cure any of the other deficiencies of Cookmeyer. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 6, 20 and 34 be withdrawn.

#### Conclusion

The applicants believe that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Fredrik Mollborn  
Reg. No. 48,587

P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
(650) 961-8300